DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 437 UD 012 949

AUTHOR	Rempson, Joe L.
TITLE	Minority Access to Higher Education in New York City. City Almanac, Volume 7, Number 2, August 1972.
INSTITUTION	New School for Social Research, New York, N. Y. Center for New York City Affairs.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	City Almanac, Center for New York City Affairs, 72 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011 ($2.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Bound Students; College Students; Counseling Programs; Early Childhood Education; *Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Minority Groups; *Negroes; Open Enrollment; *Puerto Ricans; Remedial Programs; Student Teacher Ratio; Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS	City University of New York; College Bound Programs; College Discovery Program; *New York City; Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

Four benchmarks may be noted in efforts to reduce barriers to minority access to higher education in New York City: (1) National Scholarship Fund for Negro Students (1949); (2) National Defense Education Act (1958); (3) Federal and New York State legislation (precollege programs to assist blacks and Puerto Ricans prepare for College, 1964); and, (4) Open Admissions Program in the City University. As a result of the various programs instituted, black and Puerto Rican enrollment in the city's institutions has substantially increased within the past few years. Only limited data are available to judge the success of these programs in achieving their goals: the precollegiate programs appear to be succeeding in that a higher proportion of the students finish high school, enter college, and succeed in college; the picture has been found to be less bright with respect to the college programs. Among the recommendations to accelerate progress in higher education for blacks and Puerto Ricans are: increased emphasis on education and intellectual development during the early childhood years; improved counseling at the high school level for the better selection of a post-secondary education opportunity; improved ongoing counseling and mandatory assessment counseling; reduction in faculty-student ratio and faculty load for remedial classes; systematic inservice training for teachers and administrators; use of trained tutors; and, a more educationally and economically integrated student-body.
(Author/RJ)

ED 067437

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A DIGEST OF THE METROPOLITAN INFORMATION SERVICE

Published bi-monthly by the Center for New York City Affairs of the New School for Social Research • 72 Fifth Avenue, New York City 10011

MINORITY ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN N.Y. CITY

Higher education has been and continues to be the major road to economic and social success. It is the only road to the professions in law, medicine, or the physical or social sciences. For too long this road has been more like an obstacle course for Black and Puerto Rican minorities in the city.

Dr. Joe L. Rempson, Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Special Education Services at Bronx Community College undertook, at our request, to prepare this analytical review of the nature of barriers to minority access to higher education, the programs which have been adopted to remove the barriers, and the success these programs have achieved in providing higher education for the Black and Puerto Rican minorities in the city. He brings to this analysis a background of experience in New York's public school system as well as at Bronx Community College which serves a large number of minority youth. We are grateful to him for this comprehensive survey of where we are in higher education and where we need to go.

In New York City, we have now assured minority access to higher education. But there are danger signals to indicate that for most of those who enter under the Open Admissions Program, college is only a revolving door. Many are dropping out, and among those who remain, many are not earning sufficient credits to graduate in less than six or seven years. This long time span intensifies the economic problems for minority groups. As Dr. Rempson says, much more must be done to insure that increased minority access to higher education leads to higher education for minorities. We would add, much more needs to be done at the elementary and high school levels to insure that students are prepared for college.

HENRY COHEN, *Director*
Center for N.Y.C. Affairs
BLANCHE BERNSTEIN, *Editor*
City Almanac

UD 012949

For some, these are exciting and challenging, if difficult, times in the history of higher education in New York City; for others, they are times that occasion feelings of frustration and an anticipation of doom. The reason lies in the coming of universal higher education to the city and the greatly expanded access that this has brought its Black and Puerto Rican minorities. No longer does responsibility for preparing these groups for higher education rest with the elementary and high schools of the city; it has moved directly to the higher education level itself. Only a few years ago, a college could assume its entering students had achieved a level of preparation permitting them to undertake college level work; this is no longer true. The implications for programming, curriculum, and administration are many. It creates opportunities and problems.

If the opportunities are to be fully exploited, the problems must be resolved, or at least their intensity diminished, and this requires public understanding of the issues. In an effort to contribute to this understanding, this paper, after discussing prior barriers to minority access to higher education and how these barriers have been reduced, describes the programs and approaches which have been developed in New York City, the results, and the accompanying problems and issues. It concludes with recommendations for action.

Barriers to Minority Access

The concept of universal higher education has received some measure of public recognition since 1947 when President Truman's Commission on Higher Education declared, "the time has come to make education through the 14th grade [i.e. community college level] available in the same way that high school education is now available." Spurred by a rising demand for more trained manpower and a rising level of education aspirations, the subsequent years, especially the last fifteen, have been marked by a tremendous expansion of higher education. The expansion has been particularly dramatic at the community college level; by the mid-1960's, community colleges were reportedly being built at the rate of one a week. By 1968, 70 percent of the high school graduates were entering colleges compared to the 52 percent who started college 20 years earlier.

Blacks and Puerto Ricans benefited from this expansion. Between 1964 and 1970, college enrollment among Blacks doubled from 234,000 to 470,000 students in the country as a whole. The expansion has been accompanied by a dramatic shift from Black to white colleges. In 1964, 51 percent were enrolled in Black colleges; only 28 percent were in 1970. In addition to the increase at the undergraduate levels, minority enrollment has increased at the graduate level as well, with a number of graduate schools modifying traditional admissions criteria.

In terms of percent of total college enrollment, however, the expansion represented an increase from only five percent to six percent of total college enrollment, while Blacks are 12 percent of the population. This means that Blacks and Puerto Ricans as well, are under-represented in college by 50 percent of their potential enrollment. Moreover, more than half the Blacks are enrolled in community colleges and a disproportionate number are non-matriculated.

RECENT TRENDS IN INCOME DISTRIBUTION IN NEW YORK CITY
See page 16

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Several factors help to explain the under-representation of minorities in the colleges. Race has undoubtedly been a factor, particularly in the South, but there is little evidence that it plays a significant role today. The major factors have to do with who and what college is for. Up to World War II, roughly, college was primarily for a relatively small socially and economically elite class; since then it has expanded to include the intellectual elite as determined by measured intelligence and academic aptitude and achievement. The City University of New York, (CUNY), it should be observed, has from the beginning served the rich and poor alike, though it has required that students meet certain academic standards.

As for what college is for, two views prevail, one commonly referred to as the "scholastic view," the other as the "societal view." The former holds that

Summary

Despite the great expansion of enrollment in higher education throughout the country and in New York City in the 50's and 60's, Black and Puerto Rican enrollment remained disproportionately low. This was due, in the main, to the low scholastic achievement level of these students, itself a reflection of the deprivation inherent in the lower socio-economic status of these minority groups. The cost of higher education was also a factor even at tuition-free colleges.

Four benchmarks may be noted in the efforts to reduce the barriers to minority access to higher education. In 1949, the National Scholarship Service Fund for Negro Students was established, the first major effort intended specifically to increase Black enrollment at white colleges. In 1958, the National Defense Education Act was the first federal legislation to give impetus to the recruitment of Blacks by higher education institutions. Federal and New York State legislation in 1964 marked the beginning of pre-college programs to assist Blacks and Puerto Ricans to prepare for college. In 1968, with the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., colleges undertook aggressive recruitment efforts to increase minority access to higher education. This was soon followed by the establishment of the Open Admissions Program in City University which brought universal higher education to New York.

A wide variety of approaches, programs, and practices have been developed in the city to increase minority enrollment in the colleges. These include pre-college programs such as College Bound, Upward Bound, College Adaptor, College Discovery Prong II and Harlem Prep, and college programs ranging from SEEK and Open Admissions to the development of non-traditional colleges such as Hostos, a community college in the City University system, and alternate colleges such as the College for Human Services, Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension, East Harlem Bilingual Institute, and the New York Metropolitan Center of the Empire State College.

Major changes in practices at the college level include changes in admissions standards, remediation courses, tutoring, and greatly expanded financial assistance. At the pre-college level emphasis is given to small classes, summer remedial programs, curriculum adaptation, cultural enrichment activities, tutoring, and arrangements with various colleges for acceptance of graduates of these programs.

As a result of the various efforts, especially of Open Admissions, Black and Puerto Rican enrollment in the city's institutions of higher education has substantially increased within the last few years. The number of Black and Puerto Rican freshmen in the City University system tripled between the fall semesters of 1969 and 1971. The private universities also substantially increased minority enrollment though not at the same rate as City University. Nevertheless, minority enrollment in higher education in the city is still only about half of what could be expected on the basis of the relative number of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the population.

Only limited data are available to judge the success of these programs in achieving their goals: for the pre-college programs the goals are to help the students finish high school, to get the students into college and to have them succeed there; for the college programs, it is to help Black and Puerto Rican students succeed in college. The pre-collegiate programs appear to be succeeding in that a higher proportion of their students finish high school, enter college and succeed in college. The picture is less bright with respect to the college programs. For example, attrition rates for Open Admissions students at CUNY's senior colleges are more than double the rate for regular students. At the community colleges, attrition rates for Open Admissions students are only 20 percent higher than for regular students but both are high. In terms of grade averages and college credits achieved, the Open Admissions students are again significantly behind the regular students.

If current attrition rates are projected to estimate how many are likely to graduate, it appears that the final attrition rate for Open Admissions students at the senior colleges will equal 60 to 70 percent compared to 30-35 percent for regular students. At the community college level it would be 70-80 percent compared to about 61 to 71 percent for the regular students.

Although the Board of Higher Education set out to guard against a revolving door in its Open Admissions Program by mandating remedial and supportive services, this goal has not yet been achieved. But the program is only two years old and was launched hastily and without adequate financing or facilities. Such a massive and difficult undertaking could hardly have met with instant success.

The major question which must still be asked is: can a college take a population which is grossly deficient in the skills normally required for college success and provide that population a college education, meaning an education wherein college standards are maintained and the purpose of college education preserved. Some say "yes" and some say "no." Whoever is right, partly right, or partly wrong, the students are there and so is the responsibility to educate them to the fullest extent possible. Much must be done to insure that increased minority access to higher education leads to higher education for minorities.

Ten recommendations to accelerate progress in higher education for Blacks and Puerto Ricans are made on page 14.

college should be limited to educating those needed in the essential professions and other occupations requiring highly trained personnel. It emphasizes standards, and adequate preparation. The latter view holds that college exists to serve the society as a whole and should, accordingly, afford the individual a chance to go as far as his abilities will take him and should supply society with any type of trained individual that it requires. It is this latter view that is integral to the concept of universal higher education, and that has resulted in increased minority enrollment.

A profile of city minority students will suggest why, even given the societal view, these concepts of who and what college is for have resulted in restricting minority access to higher education.

In their description of 1970 New York City high school graduates, Birnbaum and Goldman give this portrait of the Black and Puerto Rican graduates:

> For all schools combined, Black students received the lowest grades, followed in order by Puerto Rican students, white students, and Oriental and other students. Only 16 percent of all Black graduates and 24 percent of all Puerto Rican graduates received averages of 80 or over, compared with 50 percent of all white graduates. At the low end of the academic achievement scale, 18 percent of Puerto Rican graduates and 32 percent of Black graduates, compared to 10 percent of white graduates and 11 percent of Oriental and other graduates received grades of under 70.
>
> Only 10 percent of all high school graduates with averages of over 80 are Black, Latin American or Puerto Rican, although these groups comprise 26 percent of all graduates.

It is not surprising, then, that test results for 1970 showed that all of the 7,000 students who would not have been admitted to the City University of New York under previous admission standards needed some remediation. Nationwide, Crossland points out that on measures of educational aptitude or achievement, the mean scores of minority youth (Blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians) are consistently below the mean scores of white youth. That is, slightly over one-third more of minority youth than white youth score below average on standardized tests of aptitude or achievement.

The effect of this situation on college admissions can be surmised. Earl J. McGrath, an authority on Black colleges, points out that "even with liberal admissions standards, almost all Negro institutions reject a considerable number of applicants." He goes on to observe that one select Black institution rejected 138 applicants for every 100 that it accepted and that for Blacks the median rejection rate for public junior colleges is 10 percent.

A related factor is the disproportionate number of Black and Puerto Rican youths in the city who do not graduate from high school. One study shows that in New York City the dropout rate for Black students is about 45 percent and for Puerto Rican students about 54 percent; the white dropout rate in contrast is 25 percent.

This chilling profile can be understood only in the context of the socio-economic background that at once helps to produce it and is part of it — a background darkened by low income and welfare. Sociologists have amply documented the consistent and significant correlation between socio-economic status and school and test performance. Among the Fall 1971 CUNY freshmen class, 75 percent are reported to come from families with a taxable income of less than $8,000. (It is difficult to say however, how accurate these figures are). At five of CUNY's twenty units, about 20 percent of the students are from welfare families. In a description of SEEK students at City College a counselor, trained as a clinical psychologist, gives a revealing account of the empirical meaning of these conditions for Black and Puerto Rican students. It is worth attentive reading:

> Though many families went all out to help a student, I respected some of the SEEK enrollees for their determination to remain in school despite little support from their friends, parents and spouses. Wives walked out or two-timed male students, partly because their income was so limited. Husbands drank and gambled away meager resources. One girl's parents actually appropriated her stipend check each week. Families kept students home for days baby-sitting, attending funeral services or church activities; they seemed to begrudge the student the time, freedom or knowledge associated with college. Friends still 'on the street' or at work thought going to school an affectation and made the student's adjustment to college a painful leave-taking of the old and familiar. Many of the SEEK students did not know a single college-trained adult with whom to talk.
>
> Only a minority lived or had ever lived under what I would think of as normal circumstances, with both their own parents in established, secure households. Fathers were frequently absent, dead or leading separate lives. Mothers often had to struggle with large families and very small resources. One girl was molested as a teen-ager by her mother's boyfriend, but since no one believed her report of what occurred, she was sent to Bellevue and then to reform school; she preferred the reform school to living at home. Many parents had severe psychiatric, medical or drinking problems which students had been forced to accept.

Another aspect of the socio-economic dimension is the cost of going to college. As evident from the income and welfare figures cited, costs have been a barrier to admission to the city colleges and may well be a major barrier to their remaining once admitted. It is estimated that even to attend tuition-free CUNY, the expenses for a student run as much as $1,300 and, if he contributes to his room and board, $2,100. Nationwide, the estimate is that lack of money is a barrier to 50 percent of Black graduates going to college immediately.

CITY ALMANAC

Published bi-monthly by the Center for New York City Affairs, New School for Social Research

72 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10011

Vol. 7, No. 2 August, 1972

CENTER FOR NEW YORK CITY AFFAIRS

HENRY COHEN, *Director*

JEROME LIBLIT, *Program Director and Associate Dean*

BLANCHE BERNSTEIN, *Editor, City Almanac*

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

JOHN R. EVERETT, *President*

3

Table II. COLLEGIATE PROGRAM PRACTICES IN NEW YORK CITY TO AID MINORITY STUDENTS

Precollege level	College level
Small classes (15-20)	Open admissions
Double periods or extended semesters in difficult subjects	Other changes in admission standards
Summer remediation programs	Financial assistance
Interdisciplinary courses	Remedial courses – workshops or study skill centers
Curriculum adaptations	Extended course hours
Ethnic studies	Reduction in number of core requirements
Extra materials and special materials	Change in nature of core requirements
Tutoring using high school and college student tutors	Reduced course load
Counseling (individual and group)	Adjusted course sequence
Health services	Course withdrawal without academic penalty (up to a certain number of courses)
Cultural enrichment activities (during school year and during summer)	Small classes (10-25)
Recreational activities	Tutoring using student tutors
Informality (classroom)	Counseling (individual and group)
Student participation in conduct of courses and governance	Grace period (one to two years)
College contact through visitation and summer residence on college campus	Ethnic studies
Home liaison	English as a Second Language
Guaranteed college acceptance upon graduation (by colleges in addition to The City University of New York)	Work-study programs
Stipend	Modular scheduling
	Variant study approaches
	Abolition of failing grades and modification of letter grades
	Credits for job experience
	External degree program; college credits
	Dormitory provisions
	Student participation in conduct of courses, faculty evaluation, and governance
	Location in community
	Inservice training for faculty and administration

a school. Students are chosen in units of 100, with an organization set up for each unit consisting of five teachers (including a coordinator), a guidance counselor, two family assistants, one parent program assistant, and a secretary. All students are guaranteed college acceptance upon graduation by 186 cooperating colleges, each of which agrees to admit a limited number of graduates and provide them a financial aid package. College Bound is the largest federal program of its kind (in the 1971-72 school year, it had 11,000 students) and is considered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be one of the best compensatory programs at the secondary school level.

HEALTH SERVICES. Upward Bound, the federally-sponsored precollege preparatory program mentioned previously, is alone among the programs in requiring diagnostic medical and dental services for students and treatment of discovered deficiencies. It does not, however, provide the funds, except as a last resort; funded institutions are expected to utilize their own medical facilities and other sources of medical assistance, such as medicaid and health centers. The premise is that since many of the students have not had sufficient medical care, their attitude toward and capacity for learning have been significantly impaired.

In general, Upward Bound is focussed on students completing the 10th and 11th grades; in exceptional cases, eighth and ninth grade students are included. Five of the top ten city higher education institutions have an Upward Bound Program. To be eligible for it, an institution, with rare exceptions, must have dormitory quarters. According to the U.S. Office of Education:

> The Upward Bound student . . . is a young person with academic potential constrained by his poverty background, and one for whom conventional education has had little relevance. The student is likely to be apathetic or even hostile to education — unable to release his real talent. He is likely to have shunned academic achievement or even adequacy because he has not participated meaningfully in an educational experience.
>
> Generally, the potential that the student possesses does not show in traditional educational measurements, such as standardized test scores or grades, but may be discovered more readily through the intuitive judgments of those people who know him. The UPWARD BOUND boy or girl is one for whom a college education may become possible if the student is given experiences and instructions designed to build on the strengths which the student possesses.

RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES. Again, Upward Bound stands out alone among the programs described here. It arranges such team activities as soccer and softball, and such individ-

ual or physical activities as swimming, tennis, and chess to be part of Upward Bound Programs. College Bound is contemplating introducing golf and tennis.

INFORMALITY. This is another practice on which Harlem Prep places strong emphasis, the attempt being to provide an atmosphere for its dropout population different from that experienced by regular students.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN CONDUCT OF COURSES AND GOVERNANCE. This is another key Harlem Prep feature, again with the idea of providing a different structure for its dropout population. "Along with teachers, students plan and evaluate material to be studied in class. They organize and elect their own student council and write their constitution. They also have real economic power outside the classroom. They elect a representative to the Board of Trustees, raise funds for meeting the school's budget, administer money in the student welfare account, and are represented at faculty conferences." To a lesser extent, Upward Bound incorporates student participation features.

COLLEGE CONTACT THROUGH VISITATION AND SUMMER RESIDENCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUS. Students in Upward Bound are expected to spend from six to eight weeks on campus in an "intensive academic and personal development" program. Some of the other programs provide for college visitation. Upward Bound also has what it calls a "Bridge Summer" whereby its graduating students are given intensified help in their preparation for college and in their college programming.

HOME LIAISON. This is a feature common to most of the programs. College Discovery Prong II, for example, uses indigenous family assistants for two-way communication and interpretation. Prong II is the high school component of City University's College Discovery Program whereby graduates, even prior to Open Admissions, were guaranteed admission to one of the community colleges in the University. Started in 1965 under joint Board of Education/City University sponsorship, it operates in five high schools, one in each borough. Its aim is to discover the educationally and economically disadvantaged high school ninth grader with college potential and, from grades ten through twelve, to help him develop that potential by providing him with the motivation and background that he needs to enter and be successful in college. It has served about 3,481 students, or about 500 per year.

STIPEND. Upward Bound provides its students a maximum stipend of $30 a month, the only precollege preparatory program which does so, as far as is known.

College Level

OPEN ADMISSIONS. On July 9, 1969, the Board of Higher Education adopted a resolution directing then Chancellor Albert Bowker to "immediately determine the feasibility of initiating an open admissions policy" by the fall of 1970. Later that year, the Board adopted its July 9 Resolution, declaring that "admission to some University program" was to be offered to "*all* high school graduates of the City," effective September 1970. Originally scheduled for implementation in 1975, the impetus for the speedup was the closing of City College by student demonstrations in the Spring of 1969 and the "Five Demands," including increased enrollment of Black and Puerto Rican students. The response of the Board far exceeded this demand, committing the University to what has been described as "one of the most massive attempts in our history to provide a college education for members of minority groups, many of them from ghetto areas."

Under the Open Admissions Program, New York City high school graduates with an average of 80 or above, or those in the top half of their class in their respective high school are guaranteed a place in a senior college, though not necessarily the senior college of their choice. Those with a high school average below 80 who also rank in the bottom half of their class in their respective school are guaranteed a place in a community college, though not necessarily the community college of their choice. The use of both high school average *and* percentile rank in high school class is intended to minimize the effects of the lower grades achieved in some high schools and to provide greater incentive to students in those schools who would otherwise be under-represented in the senior colleges. In effect, the use of the percentile ranks guards against the possibility of Black and Puerto Rican students being relegated to the community colleges. Previously, only the high school average was used; those with an average of 82 or above were guaranteed admission to one of the senior colleges; those with an average between 70 and 82 were guaranteed admission to a community college.

Other Changes in Admission Standards

Private colleges in the city have also altered their standards on a selected basis for a selected number of students. To a great extent, criteria for admission are based on potential rather than solely on past scholastic achievement but none of the regular private colleges have gone as far as CUNY.

The alternate colleges, however, have adopted highly liberal admissions standards. Both Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension, started in 1968, and the East Harlem Experimental and Bilingual Institute, started in 1971, merely require a high school diploma or an equivalency diploma, as does the Empire State College and New York State's external degree program. Malcolm-King is an extension of three colleges: Marymount Manhattan College, College of Mount Saint Vincent, and Fordham University. As such, it does not grant a degree, although it hopes to be able to do so soon. Its students may take up to 60 credits there, all of which the three sponsoring institutions have agreed to accept (they must approve the courses offered by Malcolm-King). All of its faculty are volunteers, mostly from the three sponsoring institutions. Last year, it had 600 students.

The East Harlem Institute is not as far along as Malcolm-King. It operates under the sponsorship of the East Harlem antipoverty agency MEND (Massive Economic Neighborhood Development), and offers just seven courses so far. "Graduation" consists of passing the remediation courses which it requires and satisfactorily completing three college-level courses. It has had 90 students to date. Unlike Malcolm-King, it has a paid faculty.

The College for Human Services (CHS) only requires that the student live in the city, be over 21 years of age and in good health, be able to read, write, and do basic arithmetic, and have a poverty-level income. In general, however, it does not accept students who read below the seventh to eighth grade level. The student is not required to have either a high school or an equivalency diploma. The College evolved from a training program for women in low-income neighborhoods which began in 1965, to be-

come a provisional two-year college in May, 1970, with authority to award an Associate of Arts degree. Funded primarily by the U.S. Department of Labor, it prepares students for five human service fields: Day Care, Social Work, Education, Rehabilitation, and Health. Its target population remains low-income residents and its student body remains predominantly (80 percent) female. It admits 100 students each semester; usually 40 percent do not have a high school diploma or an equivalency diploma.

In the most nontraditional admissions departure of all, the Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension tried recruiting the hard-core unemployed, but met with little success.

Historically, the changed admission standards under CUNY's Open Admissions and similar admission standards established by the alternate colleges were preceded on a relatively large scale by CUNY's own College Discovery Prong I and SEEK, started in 1964 and 1966, respectively. Both the former, with its focus on the senior college level, and the latter have liberal admission standards. Anyone qualifies who has been a city resident for one year, is under thirty, has a high school diploma or its equivalent, has not (unless a veteran) previously attended college, is from a family with a poverty-level income and, for SEEK students, lives in a designated poverty area.

Financial Assistance

Reference has been made to the fact that financial assistance to minority students is essential to their college attendance, even though tuition is free. College Discovery Prong I and SEEK students both get stipends which average $30 a week; the maximum, depending on a student's needs, is $50 a week. In addition, they are provided money for books, fees, and supplies. HEOP students get money or vouchers for transportation, books and supplies, and their tuition is paid. The College for Human Services pays its students an average of $70 a week — $30 for spending two days a week on campus and $40 for their field work.

Perhaps one of the best examples of the role played by financial incentive in minority access is CUNY's Paraprofessional Teacher Education Program (PTEP). The Board of Education employs about 13,000 paraprofessionals (excluding roughly 9,000 student aides), of whom about 5,000 are in the PTEP at City University. The usual student fees are paid by the Board by contractual agreement with the United Federation of Teachers. About 500 students, funded by the Human Resources Administration, also get a book and supplies stipend. To enable them to attend afternoon classes, the paraprofessionals are given release time, without loss of pay, and a stipend during the summer when they are not working. It is doubtful whether these paraprofessionals would ever have attended college in such impressive numbers if they had not been provided these financial and time incentives.

Remediation

To increase the possibility that Open Admissions students will be successful, the Board of Higher Education mandated "remedial and other supportive services for all students requiring them." Consequently, at Bronx Community College, for example, remedial courses are offered in Reading and Study Skills, Written Composition, Mathematics, Chemistry, Electrical Technology, Engineering Technologies, Physics, and Speech. In addition, Bronx has a Reading and Study Skills Workshop, a Writing Workshop, and a Mathematics Laboratory, all of which serve the entire student body and operate on an open access basis. None of the courses give college credits. At some of the other CUNY units, on the other hand, college credit is given for some remedial courses. At still other units, though rarely, one will find neither remedial courses nor workshops nor study skill centers; the purpose is not to single out students needing remedial help. Instead, such adjustments are made as extended class time and course adaptations.

The alternate colleges also make provision for remediation. The College for Human Services has a Skills Center staffed by a Remediation Specialist that gives help to students in all areas, especially English, writing, and mathematics. Although students are not required to use it, they are expected to do so. The East Harlem Experimental and Bilingual Institute has a required non-credit remedial course in English and in mathematics. In addition, it has a required course in English Composition for which students get from 1-3 credits, depending upon their proficiency upon completion. The Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension has remedial courses in English and mathematics. The students get escrow credits for these courses (one for English, two for mathematics) which upon satisfactory completion of the respective basic courses are added to the credits received for these courses. The Empire State College also uses remediation specialists to complement its mentors.

Reduced Course Load and Extended Course Hours

CUNY's SEEK provides an excellent example of this practice. SEEK students are in a separate program within the senior colleges with their own classes and instructors. For the first two years, they get intensive remedial work in small classes (10-15) that meet for extended hours; they gradually shift to regular college courses, usually beginning with one such course during their first semester. At Malcolm-King, students are not permitted to take more than two courses except with special permission.

Work-study Programs

Work-study programs are a feature of a number of college curricula, but are usually limited to specific areas and are not intended specifically to aid minority students. The College for Human Services, however, has a social science-oriented work-study curriculum wherein students must complete 64 credits and may get an additional 30 credits for their field assignment. During their first year, CHS students spend two days on campus and three days on their job. During the second year, the plan is for them to be employed with full-time pay by the cooperating human services agency with two days of release time for attendance at the College. On the job, a student is supervised by a field supervisor who, in cooperation with the student's faculty supervisor and the student, develops a field curriculum for the student. This field curriculum is fused with the academic curriculum by the faculty supervisor into what is called the Unified Professional Curriculum.

LaGuardia also has a work study program which, although not designed especially to aid minority students, is of particular benefit to them. LaGuardia requires all its students to participate in its work-study plan, regardless of their major field. They must have three work quarters and five study quarters (the college operates on a thirteen-week quarter system). The work quarters consist of paid full-time jobs; three credits are awarded for each work quarter, with

an on-campus Practicum incorporated in the program. The plan is facilitated by LaGuardia's location in the highly industrialized area of Long Island City.

Reduced Core Requirements

The College for Human Services has just three required courses. In the most far reaching change of all, the Empire State College has no core courses and no set classes or courses. The program of study consists of several contracts with a mentor, the contract being organized around one or more conceptual frameworks, for example, Labor in the 1930's.

Modular Scheduling

This practice, or projected practice, is unique to Hostos Community College, which has set out to "do away with some of the rigid aspects of traditional college learning." Started in 1970, it is focussed on a minority population, the low-income Black and Puerto Rican population of the South Bronx. Courses are to be replaced by *modules*, which might be considered courses divided into small units which the average student completes in seven to eight weeks. A given course might thus be divided into three modules. The modules will consist of what Hostos calls *milestones*, each milestone consisting of several *performance objectives*. When a student has completed a module, whether it be in one week or ten weeks, he is to receive credit for it and proceed to subsequent or other course modules. Therefore, rather than a regular registration period, there is to be a "rolling" or continual registration. Vice President Cortado readily confides, however, that Hostos has not yet reached this stage; it is still foundation building.

Variant Study Approaches

The New York Metropolitan Center (Manhattan), one of three operating learning centers of the Empire State College, relies on individualized programming to determine the method of student study. Under the guidance of a mentor, a student may choose independent study, cooperative studies, tutorial study programs (e.g., correspondence courses, instructional television), formal courses, or some combination of these methods. The time sequence is organized around months, rather than semesters or quarters. A student can get an A.S. or A.A. in 18 months and a B.A. in 36 months, or even less time, depending on previous college work and experience. The Center, which began as a labor division to serve labor leaders, has about 400 students; 80 percent are labor leaders.

Abolition of Failing Grades and Modification of Letter Grades

All of the alternate colleges have made modifications in the grading system, as have the nontraditional colleges. The College for Human Services gives only P and F grades. The Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension gives only A, B, or C; students who fail must repeat the course. The East Harlem Experimental and Bilingual Institute issues only A, B, or P. LaGuardia gives one of four grades: E (Excellent), G (Good), P (Passing), or NC (No Credit). Finally, Hostos gives only two grades: "CR" for completion and credit, and "I" for in progress.

Credits for Job Experience

This practice has already been alluded to in the case of LaGuardia and the College for Human Services. Other examples include City University which has established a B.A. degree that allows up to 30 credits for relevant field experiences. The Empire State College will grant as many as 30 credits for life experiences. The Paraprofessional Teacher Education Program also gives credit for life experience. The paraprofessionals are provided a liberal arts program with an early childhood and elementary education specialization, although some of the students do major in other areas. One unique feature of their specialization is that it consists of Practicum seminars intended to integrate their job experiences with their academic training. These seminars are equivalent to student teaching in that the paraprofessionals, under college staff supervision, engage in guided on-the-job training which becomes the basis for the content of the seminars. This arrangement results in their getting as many as six credits for their experience.

External Degree Program and College Credits

For the first time this summer, New York State has put into effect a Regents External Degree program under which it will be possible for a person to earn an associate or baccalaureate degree with or without college study. The person need only pass a series of examinations designed to measure whether he has the knowledge equivalent to that required for the degree. The fields in which a degree is to be eventually offered include nursing, accounting, marketing, and finance. Help may be provided persons in the form of television courses and study guides. Since 1963, it has been possible for a person in New York State to earn up to two years of college credit by passing New York's College Proficiency Examinations. Nationally, the College-Level Examination Program, initiated by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1965, permits persons to gain college credits in various subject areas by taking the appropriate examination.

Student Participation in Conduct of Courses, Faculty Evaluation, and Governance

This is a practice common to the community-based alternate colleges, with the College for Human Services perhaps going further in this regard than any of the others. Its students participate in monthly committee meetings devoted to evaluation and in other periodic meetings held for this purpose.

Location in Community

One of the distinguishing features of the Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension and the East Harlem Experimental and Bilingual Institute is their location among the population that they are intended to serve. The former gives priority to adults who live and work in the Harlem-East Harlem neighborhoods and who have not had previous college experience.

The Results — Enrollment

The impact of CUNY's Open Admissions and such special programs as have been described on minority access to the higher education institutions of the city is apparent from an analysis of minority enrollment data. Table III indicates that Open Admissions in a period of two years resulted in a tripling in the number of Black and Puerto Rican students. Blacks now comprise 20.3 percent and Puerto Ricans 5.8 percent of the freshman class. Thus, each group is represented about in proportion to its share of the total population. This is a far cry from the situation in 1950 and 1960, when the nonwhite population of CUNY was five percent although the nonwhite proportion of the city population was nine percent in 1950 and 14 percent in 1960.

Three observations are in order about these data on Open Admissions.

Table III. ETHNIC CENSUS OF MATRICULATED FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN

Ethnic Group	Fall 1969		Fall 1970			Fall 1971		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Increase	Number	Percent	% Increase
Black	2,699	13.8	6,123	17.7	127	7,960	20.3	195
Puerto Rican	1,154	5.9	2,940	8.5	155	3,450	8.8	199
Other	15,706	80.3	25,529	73.8	63	27,801	70.9	77

Source: The Citizens Commission on the Future of the City University of New York, (The Wagner Report) Report of the Commission pp. 13 and 16

Note: Population percent for New York City Blacks as of 1970 census was 21%, and for Puerto Ricans 10%.

First, a majority of the students are entering CUNY's community colleges, a consequence of the admission policy whereby those ranking in the bottom half of their class with a high school average below 80 are given an opportunity to attend the community colleges whereas those in the higher ranks have an opportunity to attend the senior colleges. In the Fall of 1970, 56 percent of the Open Admissions students entered community colleges in comparison with 29 percent of the regular students.

Second, whether reference is to community colleges or to senior colleges, there is a marked discrepancy in the distribution of regular students among them, especially among the senior colleges. The percentage of regular students in the senior colleges ranges from seven to 87, in the community colleges from 19 to 42.

Third, most of the students benefiting from Open Admissions are not Black and Puerto Ricans, but whites — Italians, Greeks, Ukranians and others, like the Chinese, who together account for 65 percent of the enrollment attributed to Open Admissions.

Available data permit only a rough educated guess as to the enrollment of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the other higher education institutions in the city. New York University reports indicate that minority enrollment constituted 11 percent of each of its 1968 and 1969 freshman class. Fordham indicates that minorities now make up 18 percent of its student body, contrasted with three percent in 1967. Related data provided by some of the other top ten colleges are as follows:

- *Columbia University*, under the state Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), admitted 149 minority group students in the Fall of 1971. Barnard began a program for minority-group students in 1965; in 1968, it had enrolled 26 under this program.
- *St. John's University*, under Project Care, started in 1970, takes about 30 academically and economically disadvantaged students a year. It has 55 HEOP students and admits about 125 academically disadvantaged students a year under its College Admissions Program.
- *Pace College*, has about 200 students in special programs. Under HEOP, it admits about 30 a year and has admitted 75 under its Management Career Program, a three-year funded program.
- *Long Island University, The Brooklyn Center* has 160 students under HEOP and has admitted 175 over a four-year period under Upward Bound.
- *Teachers College, Columbia University* has a minority group scholarship program, initiated in 1970, that annually provides a minimum of 125 tuition-free scholarships, depending on the number of credits involved for each applicant.
- *The Fashion Institute of Technology* currently has eight students enrolled in its Fellowship Program and annually admits about 200 under its Conditional Matriculation Program, the majority being minority students.
- *Manhattan College* started SEBCON (Southeast Bronx Consortium) in 1969 for academically and economically disadvantaged, admitting about 35 a year.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is estimated that, as a group, the higher education institutions in the city probably have an entering Black and Puerto Rican enrollment of anywhere from 10 to 15 percent. Critical to recall here, however, is that reference is to the ten largest higher education institutions in the city where one would expect minority students to be enrolled. The smaller colleges probably have a lower ratio of minority students.

In summary, except for CUNY which is ahead of the field, the data indicate that, given the percent of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the city, the higher education institutions of the city are about on par with those throughout the rest of the country in the number of minority students enrolled in them. That number is only about half of what could be expected on the basis of their proportion of the population in the city.

The Results — Student Success

Whether the programs and practices described are succeeding depends on how success is defined. Even though there appears to be general agreement on at least some of the determining factors, such as attrition rate and credits earned, there is no similar agreement on how to evaluate these factors. An attrition rate of 50 percent, for example, can be defined as success or failure. Interpreted as 50 percent remained and graduated, it can be called success; interpreted, on the other hand, as 50 percent dropped out, it can be called failure. Sensitive, even complicated, as such an evaluation would be (or certainly could be) under any circumstances, it is more so in the present case. Involved is not merely the question of what constitutes success, but beyond that what constitutes success for exceptionally admitted minority students. At issue is what can be called the use of compensatory collegiate standards of success.

Only limited "hard" data are available to judge success and the hard data may not be so hard. They are subject to considerable error and are meager, since minority access to the city colleges on any noticeable scale only started three or four years ago and the most significant element in that access, Open Admissions, is just two years old. Nevertheless, there are some rough indicators to judge success in relation to the product goals of the programs and practices, insofar as these goals have been specified or implied, or can be reasonably inferred.

The precollege programs have three product goals: to help Black and Puerto Rican students (1) finish high school, (2) enter college, and (3) succeed in college.

With respect to the first goal, they appear to be succeeding in getting more students in these programs to finish high school than would normally finish. Normally, 46 percent of Puerto Rican and 55 percent of Black high school students in the city grad-

uate, compared to 75 percent of white students. Of College Discovery Prong II students who should have graduated — and this is the only precollege preparatory program for which comparable data are available — 66 percent have graduated, approximately 15 percentage points more than the average graduation rate for Black and Puerto Rican high school students. It is not clear whether the other precollegiate programs limit their dropout percentage to students who should have graduated or include all of their students. Nevertheless, it may be of some interest to report the dropout rates which they give: College Adapter - 25 percent; College Bound - 16 percent; and Harlem Prep - 43 percent. Harlem Prep, incidentally, designed as it is specifically for dropouts, does not use the term dropouts, but rather refers to them as students who left for personal reasons.

With respect to the second goal, more of the graduates of the precollegiate programs are entering college than are the Black and Puerto Rican graduates of the regular high schools; 92 percent of College Discovery Prong II graduates and 95 percent of College Bound students have entered college, as compared with 65 percent of Black and Puerto Rican high school graduates. Practically all of Harlem Prep graduates reportedly enter college. These figures suggest at least 25 percent more of the graduates of the precollege preparatory programs enter college than do their ethnic counterparts among the regular high school graduates.

The college entrance rate for white high school graduates in the city is 78 percent. Not only, then, is the college entrance rate for graduates of the precollege preparatory programs higher than that of regular Black and Puerto Rican high school graduates, it is also higher (by roughly 10 percentage points) than the rate for white graduates.

With respect to the third and final goal, the college attrition rate for College Discovery Prong II is lower than for either regular or Open Admissions community college students. After one year, the reported college attrition rate for a sample of 299 of these students was approximately 25 percent, compared to 40 percent for Community College Open Admissions students and 31 percent for regular Community College students.

The attrition rate among the few College Discovery Prong II students who went directly to CUNY's senior colleges rather than to the community colleges is even lower, although perhaps somewhat understandably so since they had to have higher averages to get into the senior colleges in the first place (82 or about). In any event, the first year attrition rate among 63 Fall 1970 College Discovery Prong II students who entered senior colleges was six percent, compared to 30 percent for Open Admissions students who entered the senior colleges and 14 percent for the regular students who entered at the same time.

On two other factors connected with the final goal, the data may be considered less encouraging. They are grade point average (GPA) and credits earned. Data available for College Discovery Prong II students only indicate these students are failing. After four semesters, the GPA of a total group of 201 College Discovery Prong II students was 1.75 out of a possible four points. It should be noted, however, that their fourth semester GPA was 2.13, which represented a statistically significant improvement over their previous GPAs. At the same time, however, they received more incompletes during the fourth semester, and by the fourth semester 65 had dropped out. These facts leave the meaning of the improvement in grade averages unclear.

CDP II graduates earn fewer credits than the regular students. Each semester they earned an average of five fewer than the expected number of credits. Available data indicate that regular students earn one or two credits fewer than expected each semester.

At the college level, programs have one product goal: to help Black and Puerto Rican students to succeed in college. As stated, what constitutes that success has not been defined, but three factors are commonly employed — attrition rate, grade point average, and credits earned. One other factor less frequently considered is that of college environment. Such data as exists in relation to all four factors will be presented here, with separate attention being given to Open Admissions.

In general, the special students earn fewer credits, by design, than the regular students, as the intent is to increase their probability of success by reducing their work load. Hard data are available mainly in the case of New York University's Martin Luther King, Jr. Grant Program; after two years, the average Black and Puerto Rican student had approximately five fewer credits than the regular students, a difference of about 10 percent. One-semester data for SEEK students revealed that they earned seven fewer credits than regular students.

After two years, the GPA of the Black and Puerto Rican students in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Grant Program was 2.38 compared to 2.80 for the regular students. Insofar as can be surmised, students in the other programs, such as SEEK, are performing similarly; interview comments made to the author suggest that typically they are passing.

The attrition rate for Black and Puerto Rican students in the special programs shows an uneven pattern, but in three alternate colleges it appears to be lower than for Open Admissions students in the community colleges, though the students may be regarded as comparable in many aspects. After two years, NYU's Martin Luther King, Jr. students had an attrition rate of 23.3 percent compared to 24.7 for regular students. Over a period of three or four semesters, the attrition rate range reported for some of the other programs is from 10 to 25 percent. The attrition rate for SEEK and College Discovery Prong I, based on four years or more, is about 60 percent, higher than the attrition rate cited in some of the national studies. Three of the alternate colleges (data are not available for the Empire State College) all report a low attrition rate — the College for Human Services - 11 percent after one year; The Malcolm-King Harlem College Extension - 26 percent for a one-semester period; and the East Harlem Experimental Bilingual Institute - 26 percent after one year. This is a range of about 15-30 percentage points below the attrition rate for Open Admissions day students after one year, except for Malcolm-King.

In the Open Admissions Program, students earn significantly fewer credits than the expected number and significantly fewer than regular students. The data are scanty, but revealing. For one of the community colleges, after three semesters, only 14 percent of the OAP students were earning the expected number of credits; a third had earned two full semesters of credit, and another third (approximately) had earned one full semester of credits. A sample of OAP revealed that for the Fall and Spring 1970 semester, about one-third of the OAP students earned the expected

Table IV. CREDITS EARNED BY FRESHMEN: CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE CAMPUSES -- 1970-71

Type of Student	Credits Earned					
	Less than 6		6.1-12.0		More than 12	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Open Admission*	30%	26%	41%	38%	29%	36%
Regular	8	10	24	24	68	66

*Open Admissions student defined as high school average below 80.
Number of Students: Open Admissions (Fall) = 2,654; (Spring) = 2,538
Regular (Fall) = 4,680; (Spring) = 4,445
Source: Open Admissions at the City University of New York, Testimony before Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education in the City University of New York, Nov. 17, 1971, p. 34

Table V. ONE YEAR ATTRITION OF FALL 1970 ENTERING FRESHMAN CLASS (DAY SESSION)*

Colleges	Type of Student			
	Regular		Open Admissions**	
	Number Admitted	Attrition (Percent)	Number Admitted	Attrition (Percent)
Senior	10,362	13.6	6,749	29.6
Community	4,251	34.4	8,447	40.1
Total	14,613	19.9	15,196	35.8

*Does not include special admissions programs, students for whom high school averages were unavailable, and one college for which data are not yet available.
**Defines students with high school averages below 80 for senior colleges and below 75 for for community colleges.
Source: Open Admissions at the City University of New York; op. cit. p. 32

number of credits whereas two-thirds of the regular students earned the expected number (Table IV).

In regard to GPA, it would appear on the basis of data for just one community college, that 40-50 percent of OAP community college students are failing. For some curricula, the percentage is even in the 60s. No data are available for the senior colleges.

In regard to college environment, defined as the intellectual atmosphere of the college, its social tone, its morale, and faculty-student relationships, there is some indication of potential danger signs, but as yet no overt manifestations are revealed by data. In the one known study, which deals with one college, it was reported that upon assessing student and faculty perception of the college environment for the year preceding OAP and the first year it had been in operation, it was found that there was no consistent direction in student perception, whereas significant changes occurred in the perception held by the faculty. They saw the environment as "less benign and supportive of students, less cohesive, and as having experienced a diminution of academic and social standards." On two variables — faculty turnover and the departure of middle-class white students — OAP has not been shown to have had any adverse effects.

Finally, in regard to attrition, the success factor which in the minds of many is the most significant of all, OAP students have a markedly higher attrition rate than regular students at the senior college level and a slightly higher attrition rate at the community college level. As shown in Table V, at the SC level, the dropout rate after one year for OAP students was about 30 percent as compared to about 14 percent for regular students. At the CC level, the difference was not nearly as marked; approximately 40 percent of the OAP students had dropped out as compared to approximately 34 percent of the regular students. The difference in attrition rate between the CC and the SC can probably be attributed to the fact that the SC does not include bottom-ranked students.

If one were to project these attrition figures for each level for the expected graduation period, astonishing findings emerge. At the CC level, if an average 10 percent attrition rate were assumed for the remaining semesters for OAP students, and this does not appear an unreasonable assumption, the final attrition rate would be 70 to 80 percent. The attrition rate for regular CC students would range from about 64 to 74 percent.

At the senior college level, assuming the stability of the ratio between SC and CC attrition rates, an attrition rate of 60 to 70 percent could be projected for OAP students as compared to 30 to 35 percent for the regular students. Perhaps it should be emphasized that these are extremely rough guesses and attrition data are difficult to interpret. But, assuming that the figures cited here are no. too far off, it is revealing to consider them in a national context.

Nationwide, attrition data are perhaps even more suspect than the CUNY data, as they combine information from such varied sources. Nonetheless, the attrition rate reported after the first year ranges from a low of four percent to an almost unbelievable high of 51 percent. This would suggest that the first year attrition rate of 30 percent for OAP students is in the upper attrition rate levels for the nation. The final nationwide attrition rate at the CC level is estimated at about 55 percent for regular students and 75 percent for students who are similar to OAP students. Thus, the final attrition rate for OAP students is about the same as in the nation for comparable students and 20 percentage points higher than for regular students. At the SC level, the final attrition rate in the nation is estimated at about 40 percent if the eventual number of entrants who graduate are considered (some take as many as seven years or more to graduate). Therefore, the final attrition rate for OAP students at the SC level can be expected to exceed the national attrition rate by from 20 to 30 percentage points.

To summarize the above data, the precollege preparatory programs are succeeding in getting a significantly greater percentage of Black and Puerto Rican students to finish high school and enter college. Once students from these programs enter college, their retention rate appears to be even higher than the rate for regular students but

there is some indication that their grades are slightly below average (at least this has been true for one program) and that they earn about five fewer credits than expected.

In special college programs, too, students earn fewer credits than expected, by deliberate design in most cases and, although their grades appear to be lower than regular students attain, typically they have a passing average. Their attrition rate shows a mixed pattern.

For the alternate colleges, the attrition rate seems to be less than among Open Admissions students and closer to the rate for regular students. No data are available on any other measures for these colleges.

The Open Admissions students have a markedly higher dropout rate than the regular students at the senior college level and slightly higher than the regular students at the community college level. If their present dropout trend continues, as few as 20 percent might graduate at the community college level and as few as 30 percent at the senior college level, about the same as the national attrition rate for comparable CC students, but about 20 to 30 percentage points higher than the prevailing rate for senior colleges. Further, OAP students are earning significantly fewer than the normal number of credits and significantly fewer than regular students; data for one college indicate that 40 to 50 percent of those who remain are failing. No hard data are available which indicate that OAP students have had any overt adverse effect on the college environment.

Now that the hard data have been presented, the question of whether the programs and practices described are succeeding must be faced. By traditional standards, perhaps none can be said to be wholly succeeding, and Open Admissions could be declared an outright failure. But to apply traditional standards to a non-traditional situation is at least questionable. Like so many other things, standards change with time and what is acceptable at one point in time may, for valid reasons, not be acceptable at another point in time. Certainly, 50 years ago, one could hardly imagine the existence of such a situation as just described. Not even John Dewey and his fellow Progressives, nor the Progressives on the political front, would likely have sanctioned the non-traditional programs designed to increase minority access to the city colleges, committed as some might have been to the social reconstruction of society. Much the same can be said about more recent times — even ten or fifteen years ago. But this is the 1970's and much of today's action in education, rightly or wrongly, centers around the non-traditional. From this perspective, different standards of success must be applied to the data in question. That is, is it not reasonable to expect that minority students, given their poor academic background, would earn fewer credits and have lower grades than regular students? Granting an affirmative answer, one would seem justified in saying that, on the whole, the programs and practices do seem to be succeeding in the sense that they are in the process of achieving their goals. This is not to say that they have achieved them or reached a point where they can be called a success. But hundreds, even thousands, of youths and adults are being helped to achieve their full potential, a great achievement even if the price is high.

The critical exception to all of this seems to be Open Admissions, the most important minority access route of all. It affects the most students and can be expected to have the greatest institutional consequences. It is leaning more toward failing than succeeding regardless of what standards are used. Although the Board of Higher Education set out to guard against a revolving door in its adoption of OAP by mandating remedial and supportive services, this goal has not yet been achieved. But the program is only two years along, and it would be miraculous if, having been launched rather hastily, five years ahead of schedule, and without adequate financing and facilities, such a massive and difficult undertaking could have met with instant success. Several instances have been encountered in the course of preparing this article where attrition rates, for example, high in the beginning, have dropped considerably as program personnel have gained more experience in working with disadvantaged minority students. There is no reason to believe that this will not occur with Open Admissions, given the will and the resources. For now, its shortcomings are understandable; whether they still will be in, say, five years, is another question.

Problems and Issues

The problem which must be addressed is: can the college take a population that is grossly deficient in the skills normally required for college success and provide that population a college education, meaning an education wherein college standards are maintained and the purpose of higher education preserved? In some respects, this is a loaded question, for what are "college standards" and what is the "purpose of higher education?" Some argue that the concept of college standards is an arbitrary one that lacks an agreed upon meaning and, further, that these so-called standards are not relevant to the needs and interests of today's student. There is some merit in this position, but can it be seriously contended that there is no difference between high school and college or, worse yet, that, in effect, there should be no difference? As there is an expectation that high school will be different from elementary school, it is reasonable to expect that college should be different from high school. At each level, the depth and scope of one's knowledge should be broadened and total growth progressively enhanced. One level builds on the other, each representing a higher level of growth and performance.

Closely tied to the standards question is the issue of the relevance of the curriculum. It is hard to gainsay that the curriculum ought to be made more relevant to the interests and needs of minority students and, equally, it should be observed, to the current and anticipated needs of society. There are legitimate questions as to whether some courses should be required, with a student's college success being made heavily dependent on whether he passes or fails them. But these are not considerations that address themselves to the unpreparedness of minority students. The question of whether the curriculum is appropriate has to be divorced from the matter of having the skills required to do satisfactory work in it; they are two separate issues. It is one thing to change a curriculum because it is not relevant and quite another to change it because students do not have the skills required to succeed in it. Whatever the curriculum, it ought to require a certain level of functioning that can be said to be higher than that required at the high school level.

As for the purpose of higher education, there seems to be a fair amount of agreement that at least it ought to prepare students to understand and master ideas, to give them a sense of what is and how things got to be that way, and to help them to acquire the tools they need to carry out, at high conceptual levels, independent intellec-

tual endeavors and personal pursuits. All of this points to the need for certain skills and concepts on the part of the student.

The question, then, holds: can the college take a population that is grossly deficient in the skills normally required for college success and provide that population with a college education?

There are those who will say no. As observed at the very beginning, for some these are times that occasion feelings of frustration and an anticipation of doom. They see the university being destroyed, reduced to little more than a glorified high school. They see once cherished courses dying for lack of demand and some courses that remain being "watered down" to make them intelligible to a barely literate, maybe even uncaring student body.

Still further, the opponents do not believe that deficiencies that result from a lifetime of deprivation of one sort or another can be compensated for by a few remedial activities over the span of a semester or two. In the case of CUNY, they see the university as having been asked to do an impossible job without having been given the resources to do it.

They doubt, in sum, whether a university can be a high school trying to provide students with skills that are more appropriately taught at the high school level and, at the same time, be a university attempting to provide these same students with an education appropriate to the intellectual demands of a college education.

Those who take the position that it can be done raise all the counter arguments. Difficult though the task may be, they think that it can be done. They see students who have been miseducated and who, therefore, with effective teaching can at last realize their potential. They recognize that it is a costly, late undertaking, but contend that the lives that it is enriching are worth the relatively small price being paid for it. They see the doubters as those who do not want to work with the students, and as those who would prefer to continue to live the life of the university scholar going about his research and professional activities, giving minimum time to his students.

One can recognize the merits that may be present in each position, ever mindful that whoever is right, partly right, or partly wrong, the students are there, and so long as they are, so is the responsibility to educate them to the fullest extent possible. Much must be done to insure that increased minority access to higher education leads to higher education for minorities.

Recommendations

Progress in higher education for Blacks and Puerto Ricans depends in the first instance on an improvement in their general economic and social conditions and especially on the health care and nutrition of infants and children. For the culture of poverty warps the spirit, saps the resources, and leads to behavior that is antithetical to academic success; moreover, inadequate nutrition and health care of the infant and child can permanently impair his ability to learn and develop normally.

In addition, we need --

1. *Increased emphasis on education and intellectual development during the early childhood years.* Such emphasis is part of that "tide in the affairs of men" which ought to be "taken at the flood." The role of the home in this effort cannot be overemphasized. Parent education, day care centers, and early school admittance are all essential.

2. *Improved counseling at the high school level for better selection of a postsecondary education opportunity.* Based on an awareness of the opportunities that exist and his needs, interests, and capacities, the student should have the help of a counseling team in choosing the course that appears most appropriate for him -- college, technical training, or whatever.

3. *Improved ongoing counseling.* To increase their chance of success in college, minority students need attentive counseling in such matters as course selection and scheduling and sources of academic, personal, and financial help. Such counseling can only be provided, however, when counselors have a reasonable student load of not more than 100; it is impossible with current student loads of as many as 250.

4. *Mandatory assessment counseling.* The same kind of process is needed during the second semester of a student's college career as is undertaken in making his choice of a higher education institution in the first place. The grace period that minority students are now given can and should be used for this purpose. They should not be allowed to wander through college without any firm sense of security or direction. If it turns out not to be the place for them, then they ought not to be there. They can be at other places which are more appropriate for them. *The choice should be theirs*, but they are entitled to know what the stakes are, and this is where team counseling enters.

5. *Reduction in faculty-student ratio and faculty load for remedial classes.* It is difficult to see how a faculty member can be expected to take five remedial classes of 25 students each and bring these students up to college level performance in some given area, such as reading and study skills. Yet, in some instances, this is precisely the unrealistic expectation. Tested experience is clearly on the side of reduced teacher-student ratio and reduced teacher load.

6. *Systematic inservice training for teachers and administrators.* Teachers and administrators could profit from inservice training to increase insight into the needs of minority students and to improve skills in working with them.

7. *Establishment of Skills, Diagnosis and Development Centers.* Such a center at each college, manned by specialists in remediation, working in concert with subject matter specialists, should be established. The center should be equipped with a range of auto-instructional materials and devices and, on the order of a general library, be ready to meet the student's needs upon request. Such a center at each college should prove more effective in achieving timely and rapid remediation related to the student's immediate needs than the current bewildering variety of non-credit courses.

8. *Use of trained tutors.* There is a need for trained student tutors. Tutoring is part of most of the programs to help minority students, but it is not enough simply to select a "B" student and then turn him loose on a disadvantaged learner. To be able to teach someone else successfully is an art, and tutees could profit from help to tutors in acquiring it. Properly conceived, developed, and organized, the experience of Bronx Community College suggests that this program could be one of the most effective ways of providing academic help to minority students.

9. *The creation of a required Personal Development Course.* Through such a course, students could, for example, be helped to develop more self-awareness, gain greater insight into their strengths and weaknesses, strengthen their ego, develop in-

creased achievement motivation, and get needed psychological support. Included in such a course could be occupational counseling and an opportunity for self-discovery through taking various tests, if desired, whether these pertain to intelligence, achievement, or psychological or social functioning. It could be merged with the "assessment counseling" recommendation.

10. *A more educationally and economically integrated student-body.* Studies consistently show that such a student-body has a positive effect on academic achievement. The current imbalance at some of the senior colleges, as well as some of the community colleges, should be corrected. The move toward regionalization, or the sharing of resources among both the private and public colleges, could well facilitate this.

A final comment is in order. There is a great need to know which of the programs to help minority students are working and which are not and why. This suggests the need for a careful, objective evaluation of what is being done. Otherwise, chance is allowed to determine the outcome of an endeavor that so significantly affects the lives of so many.

By JOE L. REMPSON
Chairman, Department of Special Education Services
Bronx Community College
of the City University of New York

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Birnbaum, Robert and Joseph Goldman. *The Graduates: A Follow-Up Study of New York City High School Graduates of 1970.* Center for Social Research, The City University of New York, May, 1971

Bowles, Frank. "Access to Higher Education." *The Encyclopedia of Education*, 4:380-85, 1971.

Brody, Lawrence and Hank Schenker. *Discovering and Developing the College Potential of Disadvantaged High School Youth. A Report at the Fifth Year of a Longitudinal Study on the College Discovery and Development Program.* Office of Teacher Education of the City University of New York, Report No. 71-5, January, 1972.

Carpenter, Edward. "Harlem Prep: An Alternate System of Education." In A. Harry Passow, ed. *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners.* New York, Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1972. p. 297-305.

Cherkis, Carl. *The College Bound Program.* New York City Board of Education, 1972. Mimeographed.

Citizen's Commission on the Future of the City University of New York. (The Wagner Report). *The Report of the Commission.* New York, 1972.

City University of New York. *General Plan for the College Discovery Program of the City University of New York, 1971-1972.* New York, 1972. Mimeographed.

City University of New York. College Discovery and Development Program. *Summary of College Discovery and Development Program, Prong II.* New York, December 22, 1971. Mimeographed.

City University of New York. Office of Urban Affairs. *Annual Report of the SEEK Program, 1970-1971.* Submitted to the State Education Department, 1972.

Crossland, Fred E. *Minority Access to College.* A Ford Foundation Report. New York, Schocken Books, 1971

Egerton, John. *Higher Education for "High Risk" Students.* Southern Education Foundation. Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1968.

Gordon, Edmund W. "The Higher Education of the Disadvantaged." *New Dimensions in Higher Education*, 28: April, 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W. "Programs and Practices for Minority Group Youth in Higher Education." *Barriers to Higher Education.* A College Entrance Examination Board Colloquium. New York, 1971. p. 103-126.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Doxey A. Wilkerson. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged.* New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Gosselin, J. E. R. "Statistics on Entering Day Freshmen." Bronx Community College, The City University of New York, 1972.

IRCD Bulletin. "Harlem Prep." Publication of the *ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged.* Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, 4:7, New York, September, 1971.

Kendrick, S. A. and Charles I. Thomas. "Transition from School to College." *Review of Educational Research*, 40:151-79, February, 1970.

McGrath, Earl J. "Predominantly Negro Colleges." *The Encyclopedia of Education*, 7:192-96, 1971.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. *The Disadvantaged Student: Special Collegiate Programs.* New York, 1968.

Office of Institutional Research. Bronx Community College of the City University of New York. *Open Admissions Evaluation Project.* Parts A, B, and C New York, 1972. Mimeographed.

Office of Institutional Research. Bronx Community College of the City University of New York. *BIC 2-72. Attrition and Student Progress at Bronx Community College, September 1970 to January 1972.* New York, March, 1972.

Office of Institutional Research. Bronx Community College of the City University of New York. *The Impact of Open Admissions on College Environment.* New York, January, 1972.

Office of Institutional Research. New York University. *The Martin Luther King, Jr. Grant Program After Two Years.* May, 1971.

Office of University Relations of the City University of New York. *The Open Admissions Story: 1970 at the City University of New York.* New York, n.d.

O'Neil, Robert M. "Beyond the Threshold: Changing Patterns of Access to Higher Education." In W. Todd Furniss, ed. *Higher Education for Everybody?* Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1971. p. 115-25.

Open Admissions at the City University of New York. Testimony before Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education by the City University of New York. New York, November 17, 1971. Mimeographed.

Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1972. p. 243-59.

Panos, Robert J. "College Attendance, Interrupted." *The Encyclopedia of Education*, 2:207-10, 1971.

Ruchkin, Judith P. "Selected Issues in Collegiate Compensatory Education." In A. Harry Passow, *op. cit.*

Scheffler, Linda Weingarten. "What 70 SEEK Kids Taught Their Counselor." *The New York Times Magazine*, November 16, 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of Higher Education. Division of Student Assistance. *Application Information and Program Manual: Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services. — Programs to Help Youth from Low-Income Families Achieve a College Education.* Washington, D.C., November, 1971.

To meet the need of the manpower profession for highly-trained and skilled personnel in Administration, Planning and Training

A TWO-YEAR PROGRAM OF PART-TIME STUDY LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

This graduate program is designed to provide persons presently employed in the manpower field with the broad foundation of theoretical and practical knowledge and professional skills they require in order to upgrade their backgrounds and assume positions of leadership in public and private manpower programs.

Applications for admission in the Fall 1972 semester, beginning September 26, must be submitted by September 15, 1972. For admission in the Spring 1973 semester, applications must be submitted by December 30, 1972.

For information and applications, please write to:
Henry Cohen, Director, Center for New York City Affairs, New School for Social Research.